

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/752,652	01/07/2004	Barry G. Anderson	015005-9450-00	4091
23409 75	90 12/04/2006		EXAMINER	
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH, LLP 100 E WISCONSIN AVENUE			ANDERSON, CATHARINE L	
MILWAUKEE	· · · · - · · · ·		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		3761	
			DATE MAILED: 12/04/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

\mathcal{C}	_
−V	ℯⅇ
Λ.	()
U	•

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Commence	10/752,652	ANDERSON ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	C. Lynne Anderson	3761			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 September 2006</u> . 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 18 September 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's argument that the drainhead of Bemis is not moveable between a first position and a second position, it is noted that the drainhead 78 is part of the cartridge 188, which is moveable, as disclosed in column 7, lines 1-5.

In response to the applicant's argument that the drainhead of Bemis is not coupled to the swingarm, it is noted that the drainhead is shown in figure 17 as being covered by, and therefore coupled to, the swingarm.

In response to the applicant's argument that the drainhead of Bemis is not engaged with the cover, it is noted that the form of engagement between the drainhead and the cover is not disclosed in the instant claims. The drainhead of Bemis is integral with, and therefore engaged with, the cover.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bemis et al. (5,931,822).

Art Unit: 3761

With respect to claims 1 and 14-17, Bemis discloses a medical device for draining a suction canister 10, as shown in figure 1, having a cover 22 and a liner 14, the cover 22 having a port 320. A housing 400 has a swingarm 484 coupled thereto, the swing arm being movable between a first, or upper, position, and a second, or lower position, as show in figure 16. A drainhead 78 has a passageway 86 therein, and is movable between a first position and a second position, as shown in figures 12 and 13, the second position allowing access to the canister. A support member 464 on the swingarm 484 supports the canister, as shown in figure 16. A suction source drains fluid from the canister through the drainhead to a sewer, as disclosed in column 1, lines 59-62.

With respect to claims 2 and 3, the swingarm and the drainhead interlock, as shown in figure 17, and the swingarm is unable to move further.

With respect to claim 4, the support member 464 includes an alignment member comprising branched arms that surround the cover to align the canister relative to the drainhead, as shown in figure 16.

With respect to claim 5, a finger notch engages the cover with the canister, as shown in figure 9.

With respect to claim 6, the suction source is activated when the swingarm is in the second position, as disclosed in column 11, lines 34-38.

With respect to claim 7, the support member further includes a rigid walled container 416 into which the canister is capable of being positioned, as shown in figure 16.

Application/Control Number: 10/752,652

Art Unit: 3761

With respect to claim 8, an air tight seal is created when the drainhead is in its second position in order to create a vacuum seal required to drain the canister, as disclosed in column 11, lines 34-38.

With respect to claim 9, the swingarm rotates on an axis of 180 degrees between its first and second positions, as shown in figure 16.

With respect to claims 10 and 11, the swingarm and drainhead interlock to fix the position of the swingarm relative to the drainhead, as shown in figure 17.

With respect to claim 12, the upper portion of the swingarm functions as a handle to allow one to grasp the swingarm during use.

With respect to claim 13, the suction source includes a jet pump 604.

With respect to claims 18-21, the method of use of the drainage device is described in column 11, lines 34-67.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Application/Control Number: 10/752,652

Art Unit: 3761

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 14-21 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,626,877. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because rotation of the apparatus by the swingarm to an upright position during drainage would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow the apparatus to drain.

Claims 1-21 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/834,594. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims and the patented claims provide substantially identical structures and methods.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3761

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Lynne Anderson whose telephone number is (571) 272-4932. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tanya Zalukaeva can be reached on (571) 272-1115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/752,652

Art Unit: 3761

Cla November 26, 2006

TATYANA ZALUKAEVA

Page 7

SUPERVISO